

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,926	02/27/2004	Silke Wolff	4965-000176	8928
	7590 01/17/2007 CKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 828			BOLDEN, ELIZABETH A	
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1755	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/17/2007	PAPER	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		(-)				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/789,926	WOLFF ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Elizabeth A. Bolden	1755				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re and will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	CATION.  apply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20	July 2006.					
,						
3) Since this application is in condition for allow						
closed in accordance with the practice under	r Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application	on. ·					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>3-18</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2 and 19</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) 1 is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.	•				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac	ccepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to th						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received in A	pplication No				
<ol><li>Copies of the certified copies of the principle.</li></ol>	iority documents have been	received in this National Stage				
application from the International Bure	·					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not	received.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/27/04, 11/30/04</u> .	6)  Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/789,926

Art Unit: 1755

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-12 and 19, with further of the elected Species A, claims 1, 2, and 19 in the reply filed on 20 July 2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

In addition to claims 13-18 indicated by the Applicant's Representative as withdrawn from consideration, the claims of the non-elected Species B and C of the previous Office Action, which were not elected should also have status indicators labeling the claims 3-12 as withdrawn.

### Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

## Information Disclosure Statement

The IDS submitted 27 February 2004 and 30 November 2004 have been considered by the Examiner.

## Claim Objections

Claims 1 objected to because of the following informalities: typographical errors.

In Claim 1 the weight percent ranges for  $P_2O_5$  and CaO both have a starting value of "0.". It is believed that the value for  $P_2O_5$  should actually be 0.1 weight percent based on paragraphs [0033] and [0042]. It is not completely clear what the value for the CaO should actually be based on the specification. See paragraphs [0033], [0036], and [0045]. For the purposes of examination the lower limit for  $P_2O_5$  will be set at 0.1 wt % and the lower limit of CaO will be set at 0.0 wt percent.

Appropriate correction is required.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/789,926

Art Unit: 1755

Claims 1, 2, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al, U.S. Patent 5,747,395.

Smith et al. teach glass composition having overlapping ranges of components with instant claims 1, 2, and 19. See Abstract and column 2, lines 35-52.

Smith et al. fail to teach any examples or ranges that are sufficiently specific to anticipate the instant claims. Overlapping ranges have been held to establish *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected from the overlapping portion of the ranges taught by the reference because overlapping ranges have been held to establish *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Speit et al, U.S. Patent 4,520,115.

Speit et al. teach glass composition having overlapping ranges of components with instant claim 19. See Abstract and column 2, lines 32-61

Speit et al. fail to teach any examples or ranges that are sufficiently specific to anticipate the instant claims. Overlapping ranges have been held to establish *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected from the overlapping portion of the ranges taught by the reference because overlapping ranges have been held to establish *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

Claims 1, 2, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al, Japanese Patent Publication 60-221338 A

The English language Abstract that was filed with the IDS will be used for this rejection, the examiner will cite the Abstract.

Inoue teaches glass composition having overlapping ranges of components with instant claims 1, 2, and 19. See Abstract.

Application/Control Number: 10/789,926

Art Unit: 1755

Inoue fails to teach any examples or ranges that are sufficiently specific to anticipate the instant claims. Overlapping ranges have been held to establish *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected from the overlapping portion of the ranges taught by the reference because overlapping ranges have been held to establish *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth A. Bolden whose telephone number is 571-272-1363. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 am to 8:30 pm every Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

7 January 2007

JA: LORENGO SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER